

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 and 53-73 are pending.

Claims 1-7, 53-56, and 58-73 are canceled.

Claims 74-94 have been added.

Claims 9, 12-27, 29-38, and 41-48 have been amended. The introductory article “A” has been changed to “The” in all dependent claims for clarity.

Claims 28, 39, and 40 have also been amended to better define the invention embodiment recited therein.

The title has been amended to be more descriptive.

The Abstract has been amended to contain 149 words.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 9, and 12-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,772,395 to Hyman et al. (hereinafter “*Hyman*”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Hyman teaches:

A self-modifying data flow architecture for computer-readable structures, such as markup language, is modeled as a network of interconnected processing elements, each having a data input and a transformation input. Each processing element generates output by applying the transformation input to the data input. The output of one processing element may be provided as either a data input or a transformation input to another processing element. The resulting architecture provides a network of interconnected processing elements which are modified dynamically depending on the data flowing through the overall process. *Hyman*, Abstract.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Hyman*, for example, neither teaches nor suggests:

decomposing the document to create the second-level document, wherein
decomposing the document comprises:

applying a first first-level transform to the internal representation of the document to create a first first-level document; and
in response to the request to generate the second-level document, applying a second-level transform to the first first-level document to create the second-level document. Claims 8, 28, and 74.

Applicant also respectfully submits that *Hyman* neither teaches nor suggests:

decomposing the document to create a second first-level document, wherein decomposing the document to create the second first-level document comprises:

applying a second first-level transform to the internal representation of the document to create a second first-level document. Claims 8, 28, and 74.

Referring to col. 8, line 13-col. 9, line 8 and Figures 3A and 3B of *Hyman*, the awardtemplate.xml document is transformed once using bind.xml. The resulting transformation then transforms a second document, “awards.xml” into an output 332. Thus, since documents “awardtemplate.xml” and “awards.xml” are only transformed once each, as shown in Figures 3A and 3B, the output 316 is not a second level second level document and is not the result of “applying a first first-level transform to the internal representation of the document to create a first first-level document” and “applying a second-level transform to the first first-level document to create the second-level document” as required by claims 8, 28, and 74. Thus, with regard to Figures 3A and 3B, *Hyman* fails to teach or suggest claims 8, 28, and 74, which recite:

decomposing the document to create the second-level document, wherein decomposing the document comprises:

applying a first first-level transform to the internal representation of the document to create a first first-level document; and
in response to the request to generate the second-level document,
applying a second-level transform to the first first-level document to create the second-level document.

Referring to Figures 4A and 4B of *Hyman*, the transform “getdistinct.xml” transforms “an input tree of elements”, i.e. “records”. Thus, the first transformation of *Hyman* does not involve

“applying a first first-level transform to the internal representation of the document to create a first first-level document” as required by claims 8, 28, and 74 because, for example, “records” is not an “internal representation” of a document but is rather an “input tree of elements”.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that “records” in Figures 4A and 4B is “an internal representation of a document” as required by claims 8, 28, and 74, Applicant respectfully submits that *Hyman* neither teaches nor suggests “applying a second first-level transform to the internal representation of the document to create a second first-level document” as required by claims 8, 28, and 74. *Hyman* teaches that only one transform is applied to “records” in contrast to “applying a second first-level transform” as required by claims 8, 28, and 74.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 28, and 74 and claims directly or indirectly dependent therefrom.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
May 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839